

why they are here. And by reducing pressure on our border, it will free up our Border Patrol to focus on making sure we stop terrorists, violent criminals, and drug smugglers from entering our country.

We need to enforce our immigration laws at our Nation's worksites. To enforce the law, we have launched raids on businesses that knowingly hire illegal immigrants. We are filing criminal charges against these employers, and we are prosecuting them to the fullest extent of the law.

To help honest businesses follow the law, I propose more effective tools to verify the legal status of workers. These tools should include a tamper-proof identification card for legal foreign workers. By taking these steps, we will make it easier for businesses to obey the law and leave them no excuse for violating it.

We need to resolve the status of illegal immigrants who are already here. They should not be given an automatic path to citizenship. This is amnesty, and I oppose it. Amnesty would be unfair to those who are here lawfully, and it would invite further waves of illegal immigration. We will find a rational middle ground between automatic citizenship for illegal immigrants and mass deportations of people who've

been living here for many years with jobs, families, and deep roots in our country.

Finally, we need comprehensive immigration reform that honors the American tradition of the melting pot by helping newcomers assimilate. Americans are bound together by our shared ideals, our history, and the ability to speak and write the English language. When immigrants assimilate, they advance in our society, realize their dreams, and add to the unity of America. We can fix the problem of illegal immigration and deliver an immigration system that is rational and compassionate.

By passing comprehensive immigration reform, we will uphold our laws, meet the needs of our economy, and keep America what she has always been—an open door to the future, a blessed and promised land, one Nation under God.

Thank you for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 8:05 a.m. on August 4 at the Bush Ranch in Crawford, TX, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on August 5. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on August 4 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast. The Office of the Press Secretary also released a Spanish language transcript of this address.

The President's News Conference With Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice in Crawford, Texas

August 7, 2006

The President. Good morning. Since the crisis in Lebanon began more than 3 weeks ago, the United States and other key nations have been working for a comprehensive solution that would return control of Lebanon to its Government and to provide a sustainable peace that protects the lives of both the Lebanese and the Israeli people.

Secretary Rice and diplomats from other countries are developing United Nations resolutions to bring about a cessation of hostilities and establish a foundation for lasting peace.

The first resolution, which the Security Council is now considering, calls for a stop of all hostilities. Under its terms, Hizballah will be required to immediately stop all

attacks. Israel will be required to immediately stop all offensive military operations. In addition, the resolution calls for an embargo on the shipment of any arms into Lebanon, except as authorized by the Lebanese Government.

A second resolution, which the Security Council will begin working on as soon as possible, will help establish a sustainable and enduring cease-fire and provide a mandate for a robust international force that will help the legitimate Government of Lebanon extend its authority over all of Lebanon's territory.

Under this second resolution, the Lebanese Armed Forces, supported by the international force, will deploy to southern Lebanon. This international force will help Lebanon patrol its border with Syria and prevent illegal arm shipments to Hizballah. As these Lebanese and international forces deploy, the Israeli Defense Forces will withdraw. And both Israel and Lebanon will respect the Blue Line that divides them.

These two resolutions are designed to bring an immediate end to the fighting, to help restore sovereignty over Lebanese soil to Lebanese democratic government—to Lebanon's democratic Government, excuse me—to strike a blow against the terrorists and their supporters, and to help bring lasting peace to the region. By taking these steps, it will prevent armed militias like Hizballah and its Iranian and Syrian sponsors from sparking another crisis. It will protect innocent Lebanese and Israelis. And it will help the international community deliver humanitarian relief and support Lebanon's revival and reconstruction.

The loss of life on both sides of the Lebanese-Israeli border has been a great tragedy. Millions of Lebanese civilians have been caught in the crossfire of military operations because of the unprovoked attack and kidnappings by Hizballah. The humanitarian crisis in Lebanon is of deep concern to all Americans, and alleviating it will remain a priority of my Government.

I also believe that innocent civilians in Israel should not have to live in bunkers in fear of missile attacks. To establish a lasting peace that protects innocent civilians on both sides of the border, we must address the underlying conditions that are the root cause of this crisis.

I believe that the two resolutions I have discussed and that Secretary Rice is working on will put us on that path.

And now I'll be glad to answer some questions. Nedra [Nedra Pickler, Associated Press].

United Nations Security Council Resolution on the Situation in the Middle East

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. Lebanon has rejected the draft proposal, and Israel is not speaking out in support of it. How do you get a resolution that both sides will support?

The President. Everyone wants the violence to stop. People understand that there needs to be a cessation of hostilities in order for us to address the root causes of the problem. That was the spirit that came out of the G-8 conference; it came out of the Rome conference that Secretary Rice attended. We all recognize that the violence must stop. And so that's what Secretary Rice is working toward with our friends and allies.

Look, everybody is—I understand both parties aren't going to agree with all aspects of the resolution. But the intent of the resolutions is to strengthen the Lebanese Government so Israel has got a partner in peace. The intent of the resolution is to make sure that we address the root cause—the resolution is to address the root cause, which was a state operating within the state. Hizballah was—or is an armed movement that provoked the crisis.

And so whatever comes out of the resolutions must address that root cause. And so the task today for the Secretary and her counterparts is to develop a resolution that can get passed. It is essential that we create

the conditions for the Lebanese Government to move their own forces, with international help, into the south of Lebanon to prevent Hizballah and its sponsors from creating this—creating another crisis. And so that's where we're headed.

Steve [Steve Holland, Reuters].

Level of Violence in the Middle East/United Nations Security Council Resolution

Q. The Lebanese Prime Minister is demanding a quick and decisive cease-fire after an Israeli air raid today killed 40 people. When will we see this resolution? And if it's approved, when will we see a cessation of violence?

The President. I'll let Condi talk about the details of what she's going to do today, if you care to hear from her. But we will work with our partners to get the resolution laid down as quickly as possible. And the resolution will call for a cessation of violence. And the concern, by the way, from the parties in the region is whether or not the resolution will create a vacuum into which Hizballah and its sponsors will be able to promote more instability.

We all agree that we ought to strengthen this Government, the Lebanese Government—that's the purpose of the resolutions, as well as to stop the violence.

I don't know if you want to comment upon—

Secretary Rice. First of all, we are working from what we believe to be a strong basis for a cessation of hostilities, that is the U.S.-French draft, a strong basis for the cessation of hostilities, and then as the President said, to have a process then that can address the root causes. And we also believe that it's going to be very important that this first resolution lay a very quick foundation for passage of a second resolution. So these have to be worked, in a sense, together.

I spoke last night and yesterday with Prime Minister Olmert, with Prime Minister Siniora, with Secretary General Kofi Annan, with a number of others, and I

think we believe that there is a way forward.

Now, we understand that this has been a very emotional and, indeed, devastating and tragic set of circumstances for Lebanon and for Israel. And obviously, the parties have views on how to stop this. Their views are not going to necessarily be consonant about how to stop it. The international community has a view, but, of course, we're going to take a little time and listen to the concerns of the parties and see how they can be addressed.

But I want to just note, we believe that the extant draft resolution is a firm foundation, is the right basis, but, of course, we're going to listen to the concerns of the parties and see how they might be addressed. And that's really what's going to be going on today, particularly after the Arab League meets and Prime Minister Siniora emerges from that.

The President. Yes, Peter [Peter Wallsten, Los Angeles Times].

U.S. Armed Forces

Q. Thanks. Mr. President, officials have been quoted saying that the international force would not include U.S. troops. And I wonder if you can explain why that is? Is it because the military is already overtasked? Is it because you're afraid that the U.S. doesn't have credibility in the region?

The President. No, I think, first of all, there has been a history in Lebanon with U.S. troops. Secondly, I have said that if the international force would like some help with logistics and command and control, we'd be willing to offer logistics and command and control. There are some places where—it's like Darfur; people say to me, "Why don't you commit U.S. troops to Darfur as part of an international peace-keeping?" And the answer there is that those troops would be—would create a sensation around the world that may not enable us to achieve our objective. And so when we commit troops, we commit troops

for a specific reason, with the intent of achieving an objective. And I think command and control and logistical support is probably the best—is the best use of U.S. forces.

Mike Fletcher [Washington Post].

Syria/Iran

Q. Many strategists say that we'll never get to the bottom of this crisis unless the U.S. engages directly with Syria and Iran. Why not talk to them directly about this and have a back-and-forth conversation?

The President. Yes, that's an interesting question. I've been reading about that, that people have been posing that question. We have been in touch with Syria. Colin Powell sent a message to Syria in person. Dick Armitage traveled to Syria. Bill Burns traveled to Syria. We've got a consulate office in Syria. Syria knows what we think. The problem isn't us telling Syria what's on our mind, which is to stop harboring terror and to help the Iraqi democracy evolve. They know exactly what our position is. The problem is, is that their response hasn't been very positive. As a matter of fact, it hasn't been positive at all.

And in terms of Iran, we made it clear to the Iranians that if they would honor previous obligations and verifiably stop enrichment of nuclear materials, we would sit at a table. And so there's a way forward for both countries. The choice is theirs. Now, I appreciate people focusing on Syria and Iran, and we should, because Syria and Iran sponsor and promote Hizballah activities—all aimed at creating chaos, all aimed at using terror to stop the advance of democracies.

Our objective, our policy is to give voice to people through democratic reform, and that's why we strongly support the Siniora Government. That's why I've articulated a two-state solution between Israel and the Palestinians, two democracies living side by side in peace. That's why Condi went to see President Abbas, the President of the Palestinian Territories, to assure him that

we're committed to a democracy. That's why we're making sacrifices in Iraq—to build democracy.

In other words, we believe democracy yields peace. And the actions of Hizballah, through its sponsors of Iran and Syria, are trying to stop that advance of democracy. Hizballah launched this attack. Hizballah is trying to create the chaos necessary to stop the advance of peace. And the world community must come together to address this problem.

Let's see here. Jim [Jim Axelrod, CBS News].

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559

Q. Mr. President, in the last couple of weeks, every time the question was asked, why not get an immediate cessation and then build a sustainable—terms for a sustainable cease-fire after you get the hostilities stopped, it was categorically rejected. Yet a few weeks later, here we are. Can you explain why this wasn't done a couple weeks ago?

The President. Sure. Because, first of all, the international community hadn't come together on a concept of how to address the root cause of the problem, Jim.

Part of the problem in the past in the Middle East is people would paper over the root cause of the problem, and therefore, the situation would seemingly be quiet, and then lo and behold, there'd be another crisis. And innocent people would suffer. And so our strategy all along has been, of course we want to have a cessation of hostilities, but what we want to do in the same time is to make sure that there is a way forward for the Lebanese Government to secure its own country so that there's peace in the region.

And that deals with an international peacekeeping force to complement a Lebanese army moving into the south to make sure that Resolution 1559, passed 2 years ago by the U.N., was fully upheld. Had the parties involved fully implemented

1559, which called for the disarmament of Hizballah, we would not be in the situation we're in today.

Let's see here. Yes, Richard [Richard Benedetto, USA Today].

Diplomatic Efforts in the Middle East

Q. Mr. President, what are the specific stumbling blocks that are preventing this first resolution from being passed quickly? What are the people—what are the parties objecting to in the language that needs to be altered?

Secretary Rice. I think that first of all, I don't—I'm not going to get into specifics about the views of the parties. I think that we have to do that privately and talk with the parties privately. But obviously, this particular resolution is important because it sets an agenda for the basis for a sustainable peace. And so it will not surprise you that the Lebanese have views of what should be on that agenda. The Israelis have views of what should be on that agenda. They aren't always the same views, and so working together to get to what that agenda should be is part of what's going on here.

But I will say something that's very interesting. There is more agreement than you might think about how to prevent, again, a situation in which you have a state within a state able to launch an attack across the Blue Line.

For instance, there is agreement that the Lebanese Government needs to extend its authority throughout the country, that it needs to have the Lebanese Armed Forces move to take care of this vacuum that has been existing in the south, that there should not be any armed groups able just to operate in the south in the way that Hizballah has been able to operate in the south, that there ought to be respect for the Blue Line. These are all agreements between the two parties.

And so there is going to be some pressure from both sides to get things onto the agenda because they want to get them onto the agenda. But I think we have a

reasonable basis here that both sides can accept. I think there are some issues of timing and sequence that need to be worked out. There are some concerns about when an international force would actually be available. And so we're going to continue to work to address those concerns of the two parties.

But as the President said, this last 3 weeks has been extremely important. Had we done this 3 weeks ago, we were talking about what people—an unconditional cease-fire that I can guarantee you would not have addressed any of these items that both sides know are going to have to be addressed if we're going to have a sustainable cease-fire in the future. So this has been time that's been well spent over the last couple of weeks, that everybody agrees it's time to have a cessation. We're going to work a little bit more with the parties, and I think this resolution will be the right basis, both to cease the hostilities and to move forward.

The President. Sheryl [Sheryl Gay Stolberg, New York Times].

Diplomatic Negotiations/Situation in the Middle East

Q. Mr. President, you've spoken with Prime Minister Blair and Chancellor Merkel about this. Have you spoken directly with Prime Ministers Olmert and Siniora? And if not, why not?

The President. Because Condi is handling those conversations, and she's doing a fine job of doing so.

Yes.

Hizballah/War on Terror

Q. Mr. President, you've been quite specific in Hizballah's role as the creator of this conflict. But what is the magnet, what is the pressure point, what is the hook to get this group to accept a cease-fire, to stop shooting, and to stop kidnaping soldiers from across the border of another country?

The President. Yes, I would hope it would be international pressure on not only Hizballah, the group of Hizballah within Lebanon, but also its sponsors. And that's the whole purpose of the United States working with allies and friends, is to send a clear message that sponsoring terror is unacceptable. It's the great challenge of the 21st century, really.

Q. Do you—

The President. Let me finish for a minute.

Q. I'm sorry.

The President. It is the great challenge of this century, and it's this: As young democracies flourish, terrorists try to stop their progress. And it's the great challenge of the United States and others who are blessed with living in free countries. Not only do terrorists try to stop the advance of democracy through killing innocent people within those countries, they also try to shape the will of the Western World by killing innocent westerners. They try to spread their jihadist message, a message I call—it's totalitarian in nature, Islamic radicalism, Islamic fascism. They try to spread it as well by taking the attack to those of us who love freedom.

And as far as this administration is concerned, we clearly see the problem, and we're going to continue to work to advance stable, free countries. We don't expect every country to look like the United States, but we do want countries to accept some basic conditions for a vibrant society—human rights, human decency, the power of the people to determine the fate of their governments. And, admittedly, this is hard work because it flies in the face of previous policy, which basically says stability is more important than form of government. And as a result of that policy, anger and resentment bubbled forth with an attack, with a series of attacks, the most dramatic of which was on September the 11th.

You know, your question is, can we get people to—a terrorist group to change their

attitude? What we can do is we can get state sponsors of terror to understand this behavior is unacceptable and that we can convince some people in terrorist groups that there is a better way forward for them and their families.

Remember, Hizballah is a political party within Lebanon. They actually ran people for office. The problem is, is that they're a political party with a militia that is armed by foreign nations, and obviously, this political party with militia was willing to try to influence the Middle East through unprovoked attacks.

And what Condi is working on and I work on is to remind people about the stakes in the Middle East. And those stakes include not only helping the Lebanese Government firm up its democracy—remember, we worked with the French 2 years ago to boot out Syria. Syria was inside Lebanon, and we felt that in order for a democracy to flourish, Syria needed to remove not only her troops but her agents, her intelligence agents, for example.

And obviously, there are some in the region that don't want the Lebanese Government to succeed. I also happen to believe that as Prime Minister Olmert was making progress in reaching out to President Abbas and others in the region to develop a Palestinian state, that that caused a terrorist reaction. Remember, this all started with the kidnaping of an Israeli soldier by militant Hamas, followed shortly thereafter by the kidnaping of two Israeli soldiers by Hizballah.

And finally, the third most notable battleground in the advance of liberty is Iraq. It's interesting; if you go back to the work of Mr. Zarqawi, he talked about fomenting sectarian violence in order to stop the advance of democracy. The challenge of the 21st century is for free nations to help those who aspire to liberty. And, you know, the first question is, do people aspire to liberty? And the answer is, absolutely—look at the 12 million people who voted in Iraq. Or look at the people who went to the

polls in Lebanon. It's just clear to me that there will be terrorist activities that will try to stop people from living a decent, hopeful life.

And what you're watching now is diplomatic efforts to address the problem. I know there's—I sense a certain impatience in your voice about diplomacy coming to a conclusion. What Secretary Rice is doing, as well as me, is we are dealing with a lot of different interests. Remember, each nation at the Security Council has got its own domestic issues to deal with, as well, and so it is—I wish things happened quicker in the diplomatic realm—sometimes it takes a while to get things done. But what the American people need to know is, we've got a strategy—a strategy for freedom in the Middle East which protects the American people in the long run. And we've got a strategy to deal with the situations that arise in the Middle East—first Lebanon; of course, the Iranian nuclear weapon issue.

And, as you remember, right before the G-8, the question on your mind was, would we ever get a resolution out of the U.N. on the Iranians' desire to have a nuclear weapon, as well as whether or not we'd ever get a resolution out of the U.N. to deal with North Korea? As a matter of fact, there was great skepticism, I felt, in some circles as to whether or not we'd be able to put a diplomacy in place that would deal with these two very difficult problems.

And, in fact, during the G-8, two resolutions were passed—by the way, those resolutions overshadowed by the situation in Lebanon. And I'm confident that working with our friends, if we stay on principle and remind people of the stakes, that we'll be able to accomplish the diplomatic objectives that we have set out, which is dealing with this problem and addressing the long-term issues.

A couple more questions, and we'll get out—Suzanne [Suzanne Malveaux, Cable News Network].

Spread of Democracy/Situation in the Middle East

Q. If I could follow Nedra's question. She had asked, Lebanon——

The President. I can't remember that far back. [Laughter]

Q. Lebanon's Parliament Speaker, Nabih Berri, who has been negotiating for Hizballah, has rejected the first resolution, saying it's unacceptable. They want the Israeli troops to pull out immediately. Is that a negotiable point? And also, Secretary Rice, will you be reaching out to Berri, as you had spoken with him before?

The President. Whatever happens in the U.N., we must not create a vacuum into which Hizballah and its sponsors are able to move more weapons. Sometimes the world likes to take the easy route in order to solve a problem. Our view is, it's time to address root causes of problems. And to create a vacuum, Suzanne, is unacceptable. It would mean that we haven't addressed the root cause.

The idea is to have the Lebanese Government move into the south so that the Government of Lebanon can protect its own territory and that there be an international force to provide the help necessary for the Lebanese Government to secure its country. Remember, in Germany, the first thing I said was—or one of the first things I said—I think I said this—help me out here, if I didn't——

Secretary Rice. I think you did.

The President. ——was we want the Siniora Government to survive and to be strengthened. The linchpin of the policy is to support democracies. And so the strategy at the U.N., the diplomatic strategy is to support that notion because a democracy in Lebanon will not only help that nation address its long-term issues—such as rebuilding and providing a hopeful life—but a democracy on Israel's northern border will stabilize—help stabilize the region. We are committed to a democracy in the Palestinian Territory.

President Abbas, in his conversations with Condi, talked about moving forward with democracy. There are people who can't stand the thought of a society based upon universal liberty from emerging. And that in itself ought to be a warning signal to those of us who care deeply for peace, that people would be willing to kill innocent citizens in order to stop the advance of liberty.

Now, I've talked a lot about the universal appeal of liberty, and I readily concede some people aren't willing to—some say, well, you know, liberty may not be universal in this sense—America imposes its will. We don't impose liberty; liberty is universal.

It's one of the interesting debates of the 21st century, I think, that some would be willing to say it's okay for people not to live in a free society. It's not okay for us. If you love peace, in order to achieve peace, you must help people realize that which is universal, and that is freedom.

She asked you a question.

Secretary Rice. Our point of contact for the Lebanese Government is obviously Prime Minister Siniora. As you know, I've also spoken to Speaker Berri on a couple of occasions.

I understand how emotional this is for the Lebanese. They've been through a very difficult war. It's emotional for Israel as well. They're in the midst of a difficult war.

Let me just say that in terms of what the end state will look like here, I don't think there is any disagreement that the right solution is the one that the President referred to. It's the Lebanese and the Lebanese Armed Forces able to secure their territory. And the international help is so that Lebanon can secure its territory. And I don't believe anybody anticipates that there should be foreign forces on Lebanese soil as a result of what has happened here.

And so I think there is room on this issue to work on this issue, because everybody has the same vision—that it's the Leb-

anese Army, with support from an international force, that can actually prevent that vacuum from obtaining again in the south, so that we're not right back here 3 or 4 or 5 months from now, in the same situation.

President Fidel Castro Ruz of Cuba

Q. Mr. President, I don't think we've heard from you since Fidel Castro has fallen ill. Can you give us what you know of his current condition, what your administration's contingency plans are for his death, and how they address the desire of Cuban exiles in this country to eventually go home and reclaim their property?

The President. First of all, Cuba is not a very transparent society, so the only thing I know is what has been speculated. And that is that, on the one hand, he's very ill, and on the other hand, he's going to be coming out of a hospital. I don't know. I really don't know.

And secondly, that our desire is for the Cuban people to be able to choose their own form of government, and we would hope that—and we'll make this very clear—that as Cuba has the possibility of transforming itself from a tyrannical situation to a different type of society, the Cuban people ought to decide. The people on the island of Cuba ought to decide. And once the people of Cuba decide their form of government, then Cuban Americans can take an interest in that country and redress the issues of property confiscation. But first things first, and that is, the Cuban people need to decide the future of their country.

Progress in Iraq

Q. Mr. President, if I could turn to Iraq for a moment.

The President. Sure.

Q. When you and Prime Minister Blair met at the White House a few months ago, you were asked about mistakes and missteps. And he said the one mistake he made was miscalculating in thinking that a young democracy, as you put it, would

be born very quickly after the fall of Saddam. Are you prepared today to agree with him and acknowledge that you've had the same expectations, which were wrong?

The President. Actually, I think—I can't remember his answer; I'm sure you've characterized it perfectly. My attitude is that a young democracy has been born quite quickly. And I think the Iraqi Government has shown remarkable progress on the political front, and that is, is that they developed a modern constitution that was ratified by the people, and then 12 million people voted for a government—which gives me confidence about the future in Iraq, by the way.

You know, I hear people say, "Well, civil war this, civil war that." The Iraqi people decided against civil war when they went to the ballot box, and a unity government is working to respond to the will of the people. And frankly, it's quite a remarkable achievement on the political front, and the security front is where there have been troubles. And it's going to be up to the Maliki Government, with U.S. help, to use the trained forces and eventually a trained police force to take care of those who are trying to foment sectarian violence.

We've made some progress against some of those folks, particularly when Mr. Zarqawi met his demise. Remember, Al Qaida is in the country, all attempting to stop the advance of democracy. And the blowing up of the mosque created an opportunity for those who were trying to foment sectarian violence to achieve their objective. But the Iraqi people rejected that kind of sectarian violence; the army stood strong.

No question, it's still difficult. On the other hand, the political process is part of helping to achieve our objective, which is a free country, an ally in the war on terror that can sustain itself and govern itself and defend itself.

Okay, who else? I don't want to hurt any feelings. Yes, sir.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559/War on Terror

Q. Thank you very much.

The President. Identify yourself.

Q. Kevin Corke, NBC News, sir.

The President. Right. I knew that.

Q. Yes, sir.

The President. Just wanted to make sure you did.

Q. Yes, indeed. In reading the 1559 resolution and the draft as it's currently constructed, there are a lot of similarities, quite frankly. And I'm wondering if you could speak to, maybe, the frustration some Americans might be feeling that you've said we want sustainable peace; we don't want to come back here in a few months or a few years, and yet it seems like there will be another resolution, maybe another resolution, maybe another this, that, and the other. People get frustrated. Can you understand that and respond to that, sir?

The President. Well, the people who should get really frustrated are the Israelis and the Lebanese. They ought to be the ones who are frustrated, because 1559 clearly laid a way forward for there to be a strong democracy in Lebanon, which will more likely yield the peace. And there is a level of frustration around the world with organizations that will take innocent life to achieve political objectives. And our job is to remind people that this isn't a moment; this is a movement, and that we must deal with this movement. We must deal with this movement with strong security measures; we must bring justice to those who would attack us, and at the same time, defeat their ideology by the spread of liberty.

And it takes a lot of work. This is the beginning of a long struggle against an ideology that is real and profound. It's Islamofascism. It comes in different forms. They share the same tactics, which is to destroy people and things in order to create chaos in the hopes that their vision of the world become predominant in the Middle East.

And Condi and I will work hard—by the way, the United States can't win this war alone. We can do damage to the enemy. We can take the philosophical high ground and remind people of the importance of how freedom can change societies. But we will work with allies and friends to achieve this objective. And part of the challenge in the 21st century is to remind people about the stakes and remind people that in moments of quiet, there's still an Islamic fascist group plotting, planning, and trying to spread their ideology. And one of the things that—one of the things that came out of this unfortunate incident in the Middle East is, it is a stark reminder that there are those who want to stop the advance of liberty and destabilize young democracies. And they're willing to kill people to do so.

I repeat, this whole incident started because Hizballah kidnaped two soldiers and launched rocket attacks. And it's been unfortunate that people on both sides of the border have lost life. And we're committed to helping the Lebanese Government rebuild.

On the other hand, what we won't do is allow for a false hope. We believe that it's important to challenge the root cause now. We thought we had done so with 1559, but 1559 wasn't implemented. In other words, there was a way forward to deal with the problem. And now there's another chance to deal with the problem, and that's the role of the United States,

working with others to not only remind people about the problem but to come up with solutions in dealing with the problem. And the solutions that we are working with our friends are—in our judgment, is the best hope for achieving stability and peace.

But it takes a lot of work. And it takes commitment and focus. And that's what this administration will continue to do. We'll stay focused on the problem and stay focused on coming up with solutions that, when implemented, will leave behind a better world.

Thank you all very much for your interest.

NOTE: The President's news conference began at 8:59 a.m. at the Bush Ranch. In his remarks, he referred to former Secretary of State Colin L. Powell; former Deputy Secretary of State Richard L. Armitage; President Mahmoud Abbas of the Palestinian Authority; Prime Minister Ehud Olmert of Israel; Gilad Shalit, an Israeli soldier captured and held captive by militants in Gaza since June 25; Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev, Israeli soldiers captured and held captive by militants in Lebanon since July 12; Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom; and Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki of Iraq. Secretary Rice referred to Prime Minister Fuad Siniora and Speaker of Parliament Nabih Berri of Lebanon; and Secretary-General Kofi Annan of the United Nations. A reporter referred to Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany.

Remarks on Arrival in Green Bay, Wisconsin August 10, 2006

Counterterrorism Efforts in the United Kingdom

The recent arrests that our fellow citizens are now learning about are a stark reminder that this Nation is at war with Islamic fascists who will use any means to destroy

those of us who love freedom, to hurt our Nation.

I want to thank the Government of Tony Blair and officials in the United Kingdom for their good work in busting this plot. I thank the officials in Washington, DC,